

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action, Items 9 and 10 of the Office Action Summary indicate that objections to the Specification and the drawings are made, but further details of the objections are not provided in the Office Action. In the previous Office Action dated April 27, 2005, the same objections were made, and Applicant canceled claims 16-23 in the Amendment and Response dated July 27, 2005 to overcome the objections. Therefore, Applicant believes that the current objections in the January 13, 2006 Office Action have already been addressed, but if not, respectfully requests a clarification of the current objections.

Claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 24-28 are pending. Claims 5, 12 and 16-23 were previously canceled.

Claim 24 is allowed.

Independent claims 1, 3, 9, 14 and 25 are amended to clarify that axial pressure is exerted on the radial flange to prevent the supporting arm from unwanted rotation relative to the mounting plate and the cover. Support for these amendments is found throughout the specification, including paragraphs [0018] and [0019].

The rejection of claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 25-28 as anticipated by U.S. No. 3,433,444 to Smith is respectfully traversed. "To anticipate a claim, the reference must teach every element of the claim." MPEP § 2131. In the present case, Smith does not meet this standard.

As amended, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 25-28 call for exerting axial pressure on the radial flange to prevent the supporting arm from unwanted rotation relative to the mounting plate and the cover. By contrast, the device in the Smith reference does not prevent unwanted rotation by exerting axial pressure on a radial flange. Rather, the Smith device uses two locking rings 23, 24. Because all claim limitations are not taught or suggested by Smith, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 25-28 are not anticipated.

The Office Action indicated that amending claim 1 to include language that axial pressure is exerted "to prevent the support arm from unwanted rotation relative to the mounting and cover plates" would distinguish over U.S. No. 3,433,444 to Smith. Office Action, page 4. Therefore, as amended, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 25-28 are understood to distinguish over the Smith patent. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-11, 13-15 and 25-28 are not anticipated.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that the present application is in condition for allowance. A Notice of Allowance is therefore respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge payment of any fees required associated with this communication or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0337. If an extension of time is required, please consider this a petition therefor and charge any additional fees which may be required to Deposit Account No. 50-0337. A duplicate copy of this paper is enclosed.

Dated: April 11, 2006

Respectfully submitted,



Miles Yamanaka
Reg. No. 45, 665

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P
555 South Flower Street, 41st Floor
Los Angeles, CA 90071
(213) 892-9200 – Telephone
(213) 892-9494 – Facsimile